

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,598	09/22/2003	Fumio Kubo	1131-0488P 6369	
	7590 05/21/200 ART KOLASCH & BI		EXAMINER	
PO BOX 747			CORDRAY, DENNIS R	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			, 1731	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			NOTIFICATION DATE	· DELIVERY MODE
			05/21/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	V
	10/665,598	KUBO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dennis Cordray	1731	

	Dennis Cordray	1731						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>02 May 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	HE REPLY FILED 02 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following							
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the mailing date								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In one event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
xtensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as at forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, hay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). MENDMENTS								
	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecause					
 ∴ X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because ∴ (a) X They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); ∴ (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); ∴ (c) X They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or 								
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	* **							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).								
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 								
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-9.		II be entered and an o	explanation of					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).					
0. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.								
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:					
2. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 3. Other: See Continuation Sheet.								

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments present new issues that require further searching or consideration, as follows:

- 1. a separation passage defined by front and rear walls apart from each other in a direction along said feed passage and by opposite side walls apart from each others in a direction across said feed passage and defining a width of said separation passage, and
 - 2. specific orientation of the optical detection axis.

Continuation of 13. Other: Regarding Applicants arguments pertaining to the placement of optical sensors in the apparatus of Brand et al or Kazuichi et al, the problem of stagnation of tobacco shreds in widthwise opposite regions of the separation passage is admitted in the instant Specification to be known in prior art (p 2, lines 6-32). Using optical sensors to detect stagnation and/or control flow of tobacco shreds in passages is also known from the cited prior art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been capable of determining the proper location of sensors in the front, back or side walls of the separation passage of a shredded tobacco feeding machine to most efficiently detect stagnation of the tobacco in the passage.

Note: the amendment filed indicated thereon that it is dated May 3, 2007 with a signature date of May 3, 2007, but it has a USPTO mailroom date of May 2, 2007.

STEVEN P. GRIFFIN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700